IRISH

BIBLICAL
STUDIES

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

VOLUME 19, APRIL 1997

CONTENTS

Book Reviews

Obituary

On 20th March 1997 **Rev. Dr. E. A. Russell, B.A., B.,D., M.Th, D.D.** died after a short illness. He was the founder of this journal and served as its editor and later associate editor for the 19 years of its existence.   Three of the issues of last year's *Irish Biblical Studies* were dedicated in honour of his eightieth birthday and appropriate tributes were paid to him at that time. He was a man of faith, of great scholarship and of kindness and his encouragement and enthusiasm will be greatly missed by us here at *Irish Biblical Studies*.

Rev. David Templeton, B.A., M.Div., M.Th was fatally attacked by intruders in his own home and died on the 24th March 1997. He served as assistant editor of this journal since 1991. During this time he was a regular contributor to its pages and undertook a great deal of technical work behind the scenes.   Before his murder, he was working on preparing and Internet version of *Irish Biblical Studies*.   He was man of boundless enthusiasm, filled with creative ideas. He will be sadly missed by his friends and colleagues here in Belfast.

THE THEME OF LAND IN GENESIS 1-11 AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE ABRAHAM NARRATIVE.

Dr. James McKeown

Abstract

Four main punishments described in the early chapters of Genesis affect the relationship between human beings and the land on which they live. Sins as diverse as eating 'forbidden' fruit, murdering a brother and building a tower are all punished in relation to land. Why should this be? The answer becomes obvious when we examine the way in which land is presented in Genesis.

An understanding of the relations between human beings and the land in Genesis 1-11 is a guide to understanding the role of land in the Abraham narrative. The movement in the primeval narrative is from the ideal surroundings in Eden, where land, God and humankind have a harmonious relationship, towards ever increasing hositility until the humans are scattered over all the earth. The movement of humankind further and further from the ideal land in Eden is seen as a consequence of the progressive deterioration of their relationship with God. In the Abraham narrative, on the other hand, the relationship with God becomes progressively closer and the promises of land become more explicit.

This paper focuses on the subject of land[1] in Genesis. Attention is drawn to the role played by land in the primeval narrative (1-11) and, in particular, to the special tripartite relationship between God, human beings, and land. I argue that the theme of land is developed in these early chapters in a way that provides a

---

[1] The main Hebrew words concerned with 'land' in Genesis are אֶרֶץ אדמה and שׂדה. Although the terms are often used synonymously, each has its own distinctiveness. אֶרֶץ occasionally denotes 'ground' (18:2) but usually refers to large stretches of territory such as a particular land or country (e.g., 12:1, 5; 17:8; 21:34), or to the earth as a whole (e.g., 1:1, 2; 2:1, 4, 5; 6:4; 11:1); אדמה is used a few times to denote the habitable earth (12:3) or a particular country (12:3; 47:20), but in most occurrences the reference is to the 'soil' or the 'ground' (2:5, 7, 19; 3:17, 19, 23; 4:2, 3, 10). שׂדה occasionally denotes a particular country (14:7) or cultivated land (37:7). More often, however, it refers to wide open spaces where wild animals roam (2:19, 20; 3:1, 14; 25:27, 29). שׂדה is also used in relation to the land that Abraham bought from the Hittites (23:8-20).

foundation for the understanding of the same theme in the patriarchal narratives. The study of the patriarchal narratives will be limited to the Abraham Cycle (12-25) because of restrictions on length.

Land has a higher rank and status than air or water

In the creation narratives, land has a more significant role than air or water. The special status of land can be seen in the different way in which the creation of birds and fish is described compared to the account of the creation of the land animals. The relevant texts are as follows:

Birds and Sea-creatures

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁרְצוּ הַמַּיִם שֶׁרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה
וְעוֹף יְעוֹפֵף עַל־הָאָרֶץ עַל־פְּנֵי רְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמָיִם:

And God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.' And it was so (RSV Gen 1:24).

Animals
Genesis 1:24

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ
בְּהֵמָה וָרֶמֶשׂ וְחַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ לְמִינָהּ וַיְהִי־כֵן:

And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." And it was so. (RSV Gen 1:24).

Although the RSV translation is similar, the use of the verb יצא in 1:24 suggests a creative role for the earth. The earth has already 'brought forth' (hiphil of יצא) grass (1:12) and the use of the same verb again in the context of the creation of the animals highlights the creative power imparted to the ground by the creator.[2] The

---

[2] Thus J. Skinner, referring to the animals, writes: 'Like the plants (v. 12) they are boldly said to be produced by the earth, their bodies being part of the earth's substance (2:7,19); this could not be said of the fish in relation to the water, and hence a different form of expression had to be employed in v. 20'. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC 2nd ed Edinburgh: Clarke 1930)29.

waters, on the other hand, should 'swarm with fish' while the birds should 'fly above the earth'.[3]   While this does not rule out completely a creative role for the waters or the air, it is the creative role of the earth that is emphasised.

This high-ranking land is uniquely related to humans

Although there is probably no etymological link between אדם and אדמה,[4] the close relationship between human beings and the ground is emphasised by this word play. This unflattering assertion, that man is basically dust, elevates the ground while reminding the human beings of their inherent vulnerability; not only do they come from the ground but when they die they return to the ground as mere dust (3:19).   As products of the ground, the humans are closely related to it; this renders them uniquely suited to care for the ground and to reap its benefits (2:16), but it also means that anything adverse that affects the ground/land strikes deeply at the very basis of their existence.   To disrupt or affect the human relationship with the land is, therefore, an effective way of punishing people severely.

There is an interesting pattern of interdependence; the land depends on God for water and continued fertility; humankind depends on God for its breath and continued existence; the land needs humankind to work it and, in turn, the land is essential as the provider of food for the human beings.

The souring of relations between humankind, God and the land!

Relationships in Eden are ideal but this soon changes! When the relationship between humankind and God deteriorates there are significant repercussions for the relations between human beings and the land.   Four main punishments described in the primeval narratives affect the relationship between human beings and the land on which they live.   Punishments as diverse as, eating

---

3 Furthermore, in 2:19 it is asserted that both animals and birds have been made from the ground.

4 See F. Maass, 'אדם' in TDOT vol 1 1974.

'forbidden' fruit, murdering a brother and building a tower, are all punished in relation to land. The punishment of Adam (3:17-19), Cain (4:10-16), Noah's contemporaries (6:5-8) and the tower builders (11:5-9), are all in some way related to land.

i. The Punishment of Adam (3:1-24)

When Adam rebels against God he adversely affects his relationship with the ground which is cursed because of his rebellion (3:17-19). Although there is no indication that Adam himself is cursed, a curse on the ground comes close to being a curse on him since, as we have already seen, he originated from the ground (2:7; cf. 3:19). In practical terms the cursing of the ground means a loss of fertility and the growth of thorns and thistles.[5] The human beings will be forced to eat 'the plants of the field'[6] until they return to the dust (3:18-19). The ground from which Adam is formed will eventually claim him again, but until then he will experience life as a struggle with the soil.[7] This means that 'man in his own disorder would never now 'subdue' the earth'.[8] Adam must still work the soil but the benefits he receives are greatly reduced (3:19, 23).

Following the cursing of the ground there was one further consequence of sin. This was the expulsion of human beings from the Garden of Eden. This is presented as a necessary precaution to prevent them from eating fruit from the Tree of Life. The significance of the expulsion is that the security provided by the Garden of Eden has been removed. God exercises his authority as landlord and expels humans from the very secure and fertile piece of land in which he had placed them earlier. God, 'like a landlord dissatisfied with his tenants, evicts them, not from the earth

---

[5] G.J. Wenham comments, 'Land blessed by God is well-watered and fertile (Deut 33:13-16; cf. Gen 2:8-14), so that when cursed it lacks such benefits' (*Genesis 1-15* [Word Biblical Commentary, Texas: Word Books, 1987] 82).

[6] Wenham suggests that עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה 'probably covers both wild and cultivated plants in contrast to the fruit-bearing trees of the garden' (ibid).

[7] See G. von Rad, Genesis (London: SCM Press, 1972) 94

[8] D. Kidner, *Genesis* (TOTC, London: Tyndale Press, 1967)72.

completely but from the particular parcel of land on which they rebelled'.[9]

So then, in chapters 1-3, the theme of land is developed in a way that shows the close relationship between humankind and land. The land is given by God and human beings are responsible for its maintenance. Land provides food for God's creatures and represents protection and security. The behaviour of human beings affects their relationship with the land and their rebellion against God results in alienation from the ground/land and, ultimately, expulsion from Eden.

ii. The Punishment of Cain

The second punishment which relates to land is directed towards Cain (4:1-16). Cain is עבד אדמה a tiller of the ground' (4:2). When Cain's offering of produce from the ground fails to gain him favour with God (4:5), he reacts violently against his brother and kills him (4:8).

Although we would not normally link this crime with the ground, this connection is made in the Cain/Abel narrative; the ground opens its mouth to receive the victim's blood (4:10). Cain is punished accordingly (4:11-12).

> And now you are cursed from the ground, which has opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand. When you till the ground, it shall no longer yield to you its strength; you shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth.
> Genesis 4: 11-12

וְעַתָּה אָרוּר אָתָּה מִן־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר פָּצְתָה
אֶת־פִּיהָ לָקַחַת אֶת־דְּמֵי אָחִיךָ מִיָּדֶךָ:
כִּי תַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה לֹא־תֹסֵף תֵּת־כֹּחָהּ לָךְ
נָע וָנָד תִּהְיֶה בָאָרֶץ:

Cain is cursed מִן־הָאֲדָמָה (4:11).[10] This means either that he was cursed more than the ground or that he would be cursed 'away from

---

[9] Cf. J. McKeown, *A Study of the Main Unifying Themes in the Book of Genesis*, unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, The Queens University of Belfast, 1991.

the ground'. The latter translation seems the more likely and is supported by most modern commentators.[11] This raises the question about what is meant by being cursed 'away from the ground'. The relevant passage is Gen 4:12.

כִּי תַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה לֹא־תֹסֵף תֵּת־כֹּחָהּ לָךְ
נָע וָנָד תִּהְיֶה בָאָרֶץ:

When you till the ground, it shall <u>no longer</u> yield to you its strength; you shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth (RSV Gen 4:12).

Cain's punishment is that the ground which he once tilled successfully would now become infertile forcing him to wander in search of food. Clearly the punishment is alienation from the ground resulting in lack of fertility or, in other words, famine. This is significant since it is a clear indication that famine in Genesis, may be understood as a sign of God's disapproval. The implication of Cain's punishment is that there is no one piece of land that will provide all the food he needs. As a wanderer he loses the security that a carefully defined piece of land represents. He himself recognises how vulnerable he has become. This is why he complains

וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן אֶל־יְהוָה גָּדוֹל עֲוֹנִי מִנְּשֹׂא:
הֵן גֵּרַשְׁתָּ אֹתִי הַיּוֹם מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה
וּמִפָּנֶיךָ אֶסָּתֵר וְהָיִיתִי נָע וָנָד בָּאָרֶץ וְהָיָה
כָל־מֹצְאִי יַהַרְגֵנִי:

Cain said to the Lord, "My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me this day away from the ground; and from thy face I shall be hidden; and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth, and whoever finds me will slay me" (RSV Gen 4:13-14).

---

10 As O. Procksch points out, 'Kain selbst ist der erste verfluchte Mensch, während sein Vater nur dem Acker Fluch zuzieht,' *Die Genesis* (2nd ed. Leipzig: Deicherische Verlags-buchhandlung, 1924)48.

11 See e.g., Dillmann, *Genesis (* Edinburgh: Clarke, 1897, trans W. B. Stevenson from *Die Genesis,* 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1886)191, Skinner (op. cit.)108, von Rad (op. cit.)106, Westermann (*Genesis 1-11,* London: SPCK, 1984, trans J. J. Scullion, Biblischer Kommentar, Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag) 307, Wenham (op. cit.)107.

The complaint that 'whoever finds me will slay me' must be understood in the context of Cain being driven away from the ground. The loss of fertile land makes Cain feel insecure and vulnerable. Furthermore, being separated from land is concomitant with being separated from God and Cain is found living in the land of Nod east of Eden 'presumably even farther from the garden of "delight" from which his parents had been expelled'.[12]

It is interesting at this stage to compare the punishment inflicted on Adam. The curse renders the ground difficult for Adam to cultivate but labour and toil would succeed in producing something from the ground (3:19). In contrast, Cain will be plagued by famine wherever he tries to settle and he will be continually the loser in his struggle with the recalcitrant earth which is now alienated from him.

Cain's sin, the first murder, represents a deterioration in the relationship between human beings and God and consequently his punishment is more severe; his relationship with the ground suffers even greater alienation than that experienced by Adam (4:11-12; cf. 3:17-19). As Von Rad comments,

> Cain is banished from the soil . . . the earth itself is to deny him the power of blessing. The punishment goes far beyond that inflicted in 3:17ff. The relationship of the fratricide to the mother earth is disturbed much more deeply. It is so shattered, in fact, that the earth has no home for him.[13]

Through both of these punishments (Adam and Cain) the vulnerability of humankind's relationship to the ground is emphasised (3:17-19; cf. 4:10-12). Furthermore, the narrator is establishing a principle that the earth and all its land belong to the creator who has given human beings authority and responsibility over the created order (1:1-2:9). Failure to treat the land properly,

---

12 Wenham op. cit., 110.

13 Von Rad, op. cit., 106.

either eating forbidden fruit (3:6-19), or forcing the land to drink the blood of a brother (4:8-12), affects the relationship between humans and the soil, a relationship which is presented in Genesis as of fundamental importance. The role of God in this episode is consistent with the role of 'supreme landlord.' God supervises those who occupy the earth he has made. Those living on the earth who do not behave in a worthy manner find the benefits that they receive from the land greatly restricted or removed completely.

iii. The flood as punishment (6:1-9:29)

It is quite remarkable that throughout the flood narrative a close connection is maintained between the land/ground and sin. This connection is emphasised by the frequent use of the words אדמה and ארץ, which occur over 40 times in chapters 6-8.[14] It is true, of course, that a story dealing with a flood will necessitate some mention of the earth/land. However, comparisons between the Genesis narrative and the Atrahasis story show that the earth/land motive is much more prominent in Genesis than the story of a flood normally warrants. In Atrahasis 3:1:1-3:6:50, earth/land is mentioned only three times against over 40 times in the Genesis flood story (6:9-9:11).

The close connection between sin, the land and the flood is emphasised by a very powerful wordplay using the root שחת (6:11-13).

וַתִּשָּׁחֵת הָאָרֶץ לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וַתִּמָּלֵא הָאָרֶץ
חָמָס:
וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהִנֵּה נִשְׁחָתָה כִּי־הִשְׁחִית
כָּל־בָּשָׂר אֶת־דַּרְכּוֹ עַל־הָאָרֶץ ס:
וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים לְנֹחַ קֵץ כָּל־בָּשָׂר בָּא לְפָנַי
כִּי־מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ חָמָס מִפְּנֵיהֶם וְהִנְנִי מַשְׁחִיתָם

---

[14] Actually, the word ארץ occurs 40 times in the passage commencing with the announcement of the Toledoth of Noah and ending with the declaration that the earth would not be destroyed again by a flood (6:9-9:11). It would be precarious to postulate that this is deliberate without a clear indication of what the number 40 is intended to symbolise in this context. However, this large number of occurrences of land is, undoubtedly, significant.

אֶת־הָאָֽרֶץ׃

> Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight, and the earth was
> filled with violence. And God saw the earth, and behold, it was
> corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth. And
> God said to Noah, 'I have determined to make an end of all
> flesh; for the earth is filled with violence through them; behold, I
> will destroy them with the earth' (RSV Gen 6:11-13).

Thus the root שׁחת is used in three ways in verses 11-13; it
describes: the action of the human beings, the state of the earth as
a result of sin, and the action which God takes against humankind.
Human beings have brought God's earth into a state of שׁחת and
now God brings judgement in terms of שׁחת upon them, which
means, in effect, that he destroys them. Furthermore, as Kidner
points out, this use of the word שׁחת 'makes it plain that what God
decided to "destroy" (13) had been virtually self-destroyed
already'.[15]

The way in which the ground has been polluted is discussed by
Frymer-Kensky. She argues that the contamination of the ground
has been occasioned by the shedding of innocent blood.

> The most serious contaminant of the land is the blood of those
> who have been murdered: the concept of 'blood-guilt' is well-
> known in Israelite law. Because of the seriousness of the crime of
> murder, and perhaps also because of the mystical conception of
> blood in Israelite thought, the blood of the slain physically
> pollutes the land.[16]

This interpretation links the flood story very closely with the
Cain/Abel story suggesting that in both stories the main crime is the
shedding of blood with the consequent contamination of the
ground. In 6:11 the crimes of the human beings are all grouped
under the general heading of חמס (violence) which includes
murder together with other forms of violence. The behaviour of the

---

[15] Kidner, op. cit., 87.
[16] T. Frymer-Kensky, 'The Atrahasis Epic and its Significance for our
Understanding of Genesis 1-9', *BA* 40 (1977)154.

human beings, as in the earlier stories of Adam and Cain, affects the ground on which they live and contaminates it. The laws that are given after the flood are clearly intended to prevent further contamination of the ground (9:1-7).[17] As is also demonstrated in the Garden of Eden story, God reserves the right to act against people who mistreat the earth/land which he has provided for them (4:10). God decides to destroy humankind (17) but as a result the earth loses its value as a life-supporting medium and is itself destroyed. Therefore, the behaviour of human beings has repercussions, not only for their own welfare, but also for the welfare of their land.

The turning point in the flood story is reached with the words 'God remembered Noah'. Now the process of re-creation begins. A wind commissioned by God blows over the earth and the waters begin to subside (8:1; cf. 1:2). Mountains reappear (8:5), the earth begins to dry up and the refugees on board the ark can leave and multiply on the dry land, which is now restored to them (8:15-19). This process resembles the original creation of the earth (1:1-13).

The evacuation of the ark and the occupation of the new earth is described in terms that emphasise the activity of God and the passivity of man.[18] Those on board disembark only after they receive a direct command from God (8:15-19). Included in this divine command is the invitation to all the living creatures to multiply and replenish the earth. In this sense it is stressed that the new earth is not something that man can rush out of the ark and grasp for himself. The new earth is given by God. As von Rad writes,

> God's detailed command to leave the ark is issued to all its inhabitants. Human arbitrariness, therefore, could not seize the fresh earth, newly liberated from chaos; God himself liberated the earth for the survivors. After the judgement of the Flood, man on his own could not say as a matter of course, that the earth was

---

[17] See T. Frymer Kensky, 'What the Babylonian Flood Stories Can and Cannot Teach us about the Genesis Flood' *BAR* 4 (1978)38.
[18] Dillmann, op. cit., 288.

man's domain. It was, therefore, an important matter for the faith
of those who came later, a matter about which they had to be
sure, that the entrance into the new time, on to the new earth, did
not arise from human initiative, but from God's express will.[19]

Thus, the authority of the Divine Landlord over the new earth and
its inhabitants is firmly established. Following the flood a brief
divine pronouncement is made in response to Noah's sacrifices.
Again the focus of attention is the earth. God promises that he will
never again curse (קלל) the ground as he had done in bringing the
flood (8:21).[20]

וַיָּרַח יְהוָה אֶת־רֵיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־לִבּוֹ
לֹא־אֹסִף לְקַלֵּל עוֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה בַּעֲבוּר הָאָדָם
כִּי יֵצֶר לֵב הָאָדָם רַע מִנְּעֻרָיו וְלֹא־אֹסִף עוֹד
לְהַכּוֹת אֶת־כָּל־חַי כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי׃

And when the Lord smelled the pleasing odour, the Lord said in
his heart, 'I will never again curse the ground because of man,
for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither
will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done'
(RSV Gen 8:21).

The assurance that God, 'will never again curse the ground', does
not cancel the original curse in 3:17.[21] Rather, God promises that
there will be no further destruction of all living creatures by a
flood. Concomitant with this assurance is the promise that the
normal seasons will continue while earth remains (8:22).

עֹד כָּל־יְמֵי הָאָרֶץ זֶרַע וְקָצִיר וְקֹר וָחֹם וְקַיִץ
וָחֹרֶף וְיוֹם וָלַיְלָה לֹא יִשְׁבֹּתוּ׃

---

19 Von Rad, op. cit., 129.

20 Dillmann remarks that, 'God had not strictly cursed the earth in the case of the
flood , as in chapter 3:17. The reference must therefore be to the declaration of the
decree of extermination in 6:7,13 (op. cit., 290). Wenham prefers to translate 8:21
as, 'I shall not curse the land again any further' and he comments, 'It is important
to note the position of עוד in this sentence, coming after לקלל to 'curse,' not
after the parallel clause 'never again shall I smite.' This shows that God is not
lifting the curse on the ground pronounced in 3:17 for man's disobedience, but
promising not to add to it' (op. cit., 190).
21 The verb for 'to curse' in 3:17 is ארר but in 8:21 it is קלל.

> While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease (RSV Gen 8:22).

Thus the future of humankind is clearly linked with the future of the earth itself. The earth, as a whole, is portrayed as a gracious gift from the creator to people who are not worthy of it (8:21). The reader is reminded that the earth he lives on is still supporting life, not because the human beings do not deserve another flood, but because God has graciously decided not to send one.

To confirm these promises, God makes a covenant with Noah (9:1-17) in which the earth figures prominently (9:1, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17)[22]; indeed the covenant with Noah is described by God in verse 13 as, the covenant 'between me and the earth'

בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵין הָאָרֶץ :

This emphasis on land in the flood narrative highlights the same ideas that have already been presented in the creation stories. We have observed in the creation narratives that human behaviour has a direct bearing on human relationships with the land. Adam's initial rebellion against God leads to the ground being cursed as punishment (3:17-19) and as a further consequence he is expelled from Eden (3:23-24). Similarly in the Cain story, rebellion results in alienation from the land as well as from God (4:10-14). This same emphasis is found in the flood story. The behaviour of the human beings deteriorates, and, as a result, the earth is corrupted in God's sight (6:11-12). God punishes man by removing him from the earth completely; only those in the ark survive (6:13-8:19). After the flood, the restored relationship between man and God is reflected in the success that Noah experiences when he tills the ground and enjoys its produce (8:20-9:20).

iv. The Punishment of the Tower Builders

---

[22]As Frymer-Kensky has pointed out, the commands given in 9:1-7 are given to safeguard the future contamination of the ground. These laws prohibit the shedding of human blood in murder and the eating of blood (op. cit., 1978, 38).

God's role as creator and guardian of the earth is apparent again in the Babel narrative (11:1-9). The reader is alerted to the importance of the theme of אֶרֶץ (land/earth) in this passage by the six-fold repetition of the word in verses 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 9.

This repetition suggests that the attitude of human beings to the earth is one of the main issues in the Babel story. The two-fold purpose in building the tower is to make a name for themselves and to avoid being scattered. These aims, as such, are not condemned and are similar to what is later promised to Abraham (Gen 12:1-3). The crime of the builders is to seek self-determination and to find security through land without acknowledging the appropriate authority - God! The divine landlord does not approve of what his tenants are doing, mainly because they fail to recognise his authority (11:6). He exercises his authority by withdrawing their ability to communicate. The end result is that the human beings, once secure in the confines of Eden, are now scattered over 'all the earth' (11:8).

Conclusions about the theme of land in Gen 1-11.
We have seen, then, that land is of major concern in Gen 1-11. It is the special domain of the Creator who exercises authority and control over it. At the same time, there is an especially close relationship between humans and the land. Adam is formed from the ground and he is given responsibility over it. However because of their rebellious behaviour God punishes his human creatures in a way that adversely affects their relationship with the land. When God brings punishment, it is in his capacity as landlord, and all of the punitive measures that he adopts against the human beings are 0in some way related to the land. The following pattern is repeated: provision of land - stipulations to be obeyed - disobedience - expulsion. Adam is given the ground in Eden to till (2:15), is warned about the consequences of disobedience (2:16-17), but sins against God and is expelled (3:23-24). The land outside Eden is given to Adam and his offspring to till (3:23). Cain tills the ground (4:2), is warned by God to do well (4:7), but rebels and causes the ground to drink his brother's blood (4:11). Cain is

then driven from the ground by famine and condemned to be a wanderer in search of food (4:11-12). Likewise in the flood narrative. The land belongs to God and he warns that his patience is not unlimited (6:3), but the human beings continue to fill the earth with violence (6:11-12). As a result, God wipes them off the face of the earth (7:23-24). In the Babel narrative people seek to exercise sovereignty over land and make themselves secure and powerful but the divine landlord shows his supreme authority by thwarting the human plans (11:1-9). As a result, the primeval narrative ends with human beings alienated from one another by language, alienated from God by their rebellion and lacking the security once afforded by the land in the garden of Eden.

James McKeown

(To be continued in next Issue)

PAUL: A PATTERN FOR PASTORS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CORINTHIAN LETTERS.

Rev. Principal T. S. Reid.

Abstract

In this essay we look at the Apostle Paul as pastor, with particular reference to the aims which directed him. We look first at objectives in regard to individual believers and then at his aim in the context of the community of the Church.

In considering the apostle Paul as Pastor, we have to face the problem that arises from the fact that Paul did not set out to give a systematic description of the pastor or his activities and responsibilities. Indeed, he never used the word "pastor" to describe himself. Any information about the topic is given incidentally as he dealt with matters that arose day by day and must be gathered from a variety of sources, collated and interpreted.

Our first task is to establish that Paul had what we may call "pastoral concern" and discharged the responsibilities that arose from that concern. It has been argued that he was at best a reluctant pastor, e.g.

> Paul saw pastoral theology as a regrettable necessity and an interruption to his primary task of preaching the gospel.[1]

However, this is disputed. D. Tidball argues:

> Paul saw both the original proclamation of the Gospel and its continuing proclamation in the Church, as one and the same process and both as manifestations of the activity of God.[2]

---

1 G. Leonard, *God Alive - Priorities in Pastoral Theology.*, (London:Darton, Longman and Todd, 1981) p. 1.
2 D. Tidball, *Skilful Shepherds: An Introduction to Pastoral Theology.* (Leicester: IVP, 1986) p. 99.

Reid, **Paul**, *IBS* 19, April 1997
citing in support I Cor. 3: 1-9.

Schultz takes the same line:

> Paul regards the Church, not only as a missionary
> enterprise to be called, but also as a pastoral enterprise, to
> be sustained and disciplined.[3]

We must then find an answer to the question whether when Paul
had planted the seed of faith, he was concerned with its
nourishment and development. If we look at the record in Acts
(14:22ff) we find:

> They returned to Lystra, then to Iconium and the to
> `Antioch, heartening the converts and encouraging them to
> be true to their religion. They warned them that to enter the
> Kingdom of God, we must pass through many hardships.
> They also appointed elders for them in each congregation
> and with prayer and fasting, committed them to the Lord in
> whom they had put their faith.

It is clear from this that Paul was not concerned only with the initial
conversion to Christ, of those who heard his preaching of the
Gospel, but also with their faithfulness, their growth in the faith and
any difficulties they might have to face. We may also note from
his action in ordaining elders, that he saw his responsibility
extending beyond a concern for individuals. It was his ambition
also to build them into a community of Christ.

> If Paul's mobility enabled him to found many churches, it
> also caused him great concern for the converts, he left
> behind. Relatively unorganised, fraught with distress, with
> only rudimentary instruction in the faith and in tension with
> the larger society; they were anything but stable when he

---

3 H.J. Schutz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*,
(SNTS, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1975) p. 182 c.f.
p. 225.

left them . . . . . . Therefore, the possibility was good that
the communities' conditions would change when Paul left
them.[4]

This clearly caused him much thought and he set it out as one of the
burdens he had to bear "the responsibility that weighs upon me
every day, my anxious concern for all our congregations", (2
Cor.11: 28), a clear statement of his acceptance of pastoral care.
His responsibilities in this matter, he discharged on occasions by a
visit as recorded in Acts 14: 21ff, quoted above or to Corinth (2
Cor.13: 1ff). On other occasions, because of other pressures, he
had to exercise his pastoral care at a distance, either through
delegates, for example, Timothy (1 Cor.16: 5) and Titus (2 Cor. 8:
17) or by means of correspondence.

> All Paul's letters, including Romans, were written in
> response to pastoral needs, although not always in response
> to specific pastoral problems.[5]

His writings contain, admittedly not with any systematic
arrangement, a pattern of pastoral care and directions for exercising
that care. He nowhere set out to write a treatise on the pastoral
office and function. Instead, he wrote out of a concern for the well
being of the people of God. From the expression of his thoughts as
he confronted various situations, we must draw out the substance of
his thinking and establish the pattern that is there.

There is another matter which merits reference. As Ernest Best
points out "It is not inappropriate to inquire what his converts
thought of Paul, as he fulfilled his various roles among them." [6]
We may state it as follows. It is one thing for a person to regard

4 A.J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Thessalonians.* (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1987) p. 61.
5 Leonard op cit. p. 2.
6 E. Best *Paul and his Converts*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988)
p23.

himself as a pastor and try to discharge the responsibilities that spring from it, but if no people look to him as pastor, his is deluded. When the members of the Church at Corinth sought guidance on matters that were causing debate among them, it was to Paul that they looked for that guidance. "And now concerning the matters you wrote about" (1 Cor. 7:1) and we have a series of items introduced with the words "peri de" περὶ δέ:marriage and the relationships within marriage, divorce and separation, virginity (1 Cor.7); eating food sacrificed to idols (1 Cor.8: 1-13); spiritual gifts (1 Cor.12: 1ff); the collection for the Church at Jerusalem (1 Cor.16: 1ff). He did not confine himself to the matters the Corinthian Christians had raised, but dealt with other matters reported to him by other sources e.g. by Chloe's people, the growth of factions in the Church or gross immorality. Taking Corinth as an example, not only did Paul look on himself as pastor to the Church there, its members regarded him as their pastor. This mutual regard is crucial to the effective functioning of the pastor and when a group at Corinth became disposed to question his authority and his right to discharge such a function, he was greatly disturbed and sought to remedy the situation.

Consideration of space in this essay prevent a full consideration of Paul's work as pastor, I intend then to concentrate on his pastoral aims as these are factors determining many other matters.

When we think of Paul's aims in his pastoral work, it is convenient to divide our consideration into two sections, which are by no means mutually exclusive. We shall look first at his objectives in regard to individual church members and then draw at his aims in the context of the community life of the church.

There is no better statement of Paul's ambition for the individual church member than " to present each one of you as a mature member of Christ's body." (Col.1: 28). The clauses either side of this

> We admonish everyone without distinction, we instruct everyone in the ways of wisdom . . . . . . To this end I am

toiling strenuously with all the energy and power of Christ
at work in me.

set out his determination to work for its fulfillment and his
willingness to adopt any means possible for its achievement.

He sets out elsewhere a similar hope:
> So shall we all at last attain to the unity inherent in our
> faith and out knowledge of the Son of God - to mature
> manhood measured by nothing less than the full stature of
> Christ (Eph. 4:13).

Here he made clear what he thought of as the measure of maturity,
Christ himself.

It is clear then that Paul was not content for this converts to remain
as spiritual infants. He wanted to produce Christians who were
able to stand on their feet, progressing to become mature spiritual
adults, who were no longer unhealthily dependent on him or other
Christian workers and no longer, for whatever reason, unstable in
their discipleship. There is here an implicit parallel drawn between
the processes of physical and spiritual growth and maturity, recent
converts were like infants in their bewilderment, lack of knowledge
and lack of strength. "tossed about by the waves and whirled about
by every fresh gust of teaching, dupes of crafty rogues and their
deceitful schemes," (Eph. 4:14). If the infant child is to reach
mental as well as physical maturity, he is not left just to grow, he
must be nurtured. This attainment to adulthood is not necessarily
tied to any particular span of years, it is a matter of being mature in
the sense that,

> (a person) knows his rights and responsibilities and can
> assume the burdens and joys of being man or woman" [7]

---

7 Jacob Firet *Dynamics in Pastoring.* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans,
1986) p. 180.

Nurture or care directed to this and may be described as:

> the help given by persons responsible for the development
> of a child which leads the child to the ability, as an adult to
> fulfill the life mandate of an adult. [8]

Translating this into more concrete terms in the setting of Paul's
activities as recorded in the N.T., it meant that he set out to teach
truth, to encourage faithfulness, promote right living and develop
unity in the churches. Full life in Christ was threatened in various
ways, by those things which added to the gospel, such as legalism,
asceticism, or gnosticism, or by libertinism which subtracted from
it. These had to be combatted and much space was taken up in
Paul's letters as he dealt with these matters, so that much of his
time and energy was taken up with pastoral concerns as he
countered error with the aim of producing mature loyalty to Christ
in every disciple.

We must take note that it was not Paul's aim to produce a mindless,
unthinking obedience and compliance with his own ideas, rather,
consistent with his aim of producing maturity, he set out to enable
believers to work things through for themselves. On the occasions
when he appeared to be imposing his ideas on the church, it was
because he was concerned that the central truths of the gospel were
at stake [9] His approach more often was to invite assent to the truth
of what he said, based on what they already knew e.g.

> And now, my brothers, I must remind you . . . (1 Cor.15:1,
> c.f. Rom.15: 15; Phil 3: 15).

---

8 ibid p. 181.
9 H. Von Camperhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual
Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (London: A & C
Black, 1969) p. 51.

Only in this way would they be able to become responsible for their own spiritual condition. As J.Firet puts it in a discussion of what he call the "agogic factor" in the pastoral relationship.

> the pastor many not make choices for the other in the relationship, 'but', must bring within reach of the other's experience what true discernment is [10]

Pastoral care or nurture in the faith, must then be distinguished from indoctrination or conditioning which would take away a person's right to self determination.

It is worth noting that Paul did not use the very strong words of command ἐπιτάγη & ἐπιτάσσειν when referring to his own instructions, expressly repudiating any idea of compulsion, instead offering guidance and issuing appeals. The words διατάσσειν & παραγγέλλειν are to be found, but with one exception (Co. 4: 10), always in Corinthians and the two Thessalonian letters. It was in these letters that Paul adopted an authoritative tone because of the seriousness with which he viewed the situation there. Elsewhere, he preferred not to speak in such terms, choosing to express himself more gently, e.g.

> "If then our common life in Christ yields anything to stir the heart, any loving consolation, any sharing of the Spirit, any warmth of affection or compassion, fill up my cup of happiness by thinking and feeling alike." (Phil. 3:1).

And

> Accordingly, although in Christ, I might make bold to point out your duty, yet because of that same love, I would rather appeal to you (Philemon 8,9, c.f. Gal.3:17).

---

10 Firet op cit p 222 of *The Child in the Church* (British Council of Churches, 1976) p. 21.

This strategy was no mere technique on Paul's part, adopted with the hope of ensuring their more willing compliance. It was the only strategy consistent with his view of the gospel.

> Christ set us free, to be free men. Stand firm then and refuse to be tied to the yoke of slavery again. (Gal.5:1).

To substitute one set of chains for another, even if manufactured by Paul, in what he saw as the best interests of the Church, would be to deny that freedom which he saw as being of the essence of the gospel.

> Recognition of the one being nurtured as equihuman by the one nurturing, is basic to the whole process if unhealthy domination and dependence are to be avoided[11]

For all his apostolic status and authority and his part in founding a church, he did wish to set himself above it and its members or behave in an authoritarian way towards them. To do so would be to render him guilty of not giving them the respect that was their due and would also tend to prevent them from achieving that freedom and maturity in Christ that was his objective. He could not gain maturity on their behalf, nor endow them with it, but he could encourage and try to help them towards it, for always.

> Personhood (or maturity) is an achievement in so far as a person is created by his own free decisions and won against sufferings and disadvantages.[12]

We note then in Paul's concern for the development of the Christian, his stress on the co-operation or participation by the Christian in his own development and his responsibility for it: "You must work out your own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil.2:12). The pastor must not seek to accept a responsibility

---

11 ibid p. 220
12 B.C.C. *Child in the Church* p. 22.

which ultimately is not his, nor ever can be, but must aim for the situation to develop, so that he can step out of the picture and leave the person who is the object of his concern standing on his own feet, mature and free [13]

It must be stressed that this freedom is not absolute; independence may mean independence from the pastor, but never independence from Christ or freedom from Christian obligations:

> You, my friends, were called to be free men, only do not turn your freedom into license for your lower nature, but be servants to one another in love. (Gal. 5:13).

From a compulsory service to sin, Paul saw Christians as called to a voluntary service of Christ and others. Freedom for him was not merely an independence from certain things, but also an independence for others [14] and dependence on Christ [15]

The realisation that independence for the Christian means interdependence leads to an appreciation that no-one exists in isolation, but in a network of relationships, that is, in some form of community, whether it be good or bad, effective or ineffective. Being in a community does not obliterate the individual. On the contrary it provides the context for the individual life, personal growth and development takes place within community [16] This figured largely in Paul's thinking. He made it clear that progress towards maturity is not an individual matter, but takes place within the fellowship of the Church, for example, in Ephesians 4: 1-16. But there is more than this. He was concerned also for the progress of the Church towards maturity, as a body it had to make progress.

---

13 Firet op cit p. 220.

14 R. Banks *Paul's Idea of Community*. (Paternoster. Exeter 1980 p. 175.

15 H. Taylor *Tend my Sheep.* (T.E.F. Study Guide 19. London: S.P.C.K., 1983) p. 125.

16 B.C.C. *Child* p. 33.

His objective certainly was the building up of each believer into the life of Christ, but this involves:

> an integration of the individual into the life of a Christian community and a building up of the whole church into the fullness of Christ.[17]

> so shall we all at last attain the unity inherent in our faith and our knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, measured by nothing less than the full stature of Christ (Eph.4:13).

In his evangelistic activity, Paul did not simply issue an individualistic challenge to give up vice, but aimed at forging a community of those who responded to the proclamation.[18]

There are two aspects to be considered in this. There is first, the mutual support which members owed to each other and secondly, the nature of the community which was in Paul's mind. It must not be overlooked that these two aspects are closely related. The depth of the members commitment to each other will influence the nature of their fellowship and the depth of fellowship will influence how and to what extent they care for each other.

> The Christian fellowship is a caring community; the obligation to build one another up in the faith is laid on all Christians. [19]

Writing in 1982, Frank Wright applauds what he sees as the move away from the idea that pastoring was the preserve of the clergyman, priest or minister, whose task it was to:

---

17 ibid p. 34.
18 Malherbe op cit p.11.
19 Malherbe op cit p.11.

shepherd people through the chances and changes of this mortal life, and the laity as the objects of this pastoral care 20

The examples he gives show that the greater part of pastoral care and support has been given by unordained church members throughout the years. This is in keeping with the mind of Paul. Writing to the church at Thessalonica, he commanded:

Admonish the careless, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak and be very patient with them all. (I Thess.5:14).

This directive was addressed to all the church members and so makes clear that pastoral concern was to be expressed in the mutual caring of the members for each other and had not yet been delegated to a "Pastor". By the time Ephesians was written, it was recognised that

while all must care for one another, some, whose Christian experience, spiritual gifts and position in the Christian community so qualify them, are especially charged with Christian oversight and pastoral care [21]

But Paul nowhere exempts any members of the church from the obligation to love one another and to express that love in caring.

In the Church at Jerusalem, careful attention was given to "the fellowship" (τῇ κοινωνία) (Acts 2: 42). This word and its associates include the idea of mutual care and of that care expressed in a practical way. The root idea of κοινωνία is "taking part with someone in something" [22] In this there are two possible

20 F. Wright *Pastoral Care for Lay People*. (London: S.C.M.. 1982) p. 8.

21 R.E.O. White op cit. c.f. Eph.4: 11f.

22 Ralph P.Martin *The Family and the Fellowship* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1979) p. 36. c.f. Hauch *TDNT* Vol.3 p. 805.

stresses, either on the "with someone" or on the "in something".
We may lay emphasis on the unity of the participants in the
activity, but for our immediate interest, the stress falls on the
"sharing with". For example, Paul praised the κοινωνία of the
Macedonian Christians (2 Cor.8: 4) and urged the Corinthians to
follow their example and to "give a literal contribution to their need
to the general good" (2 Cor.9: 13). C.K. Barrett offers two
possible explanations of ἁπλότψτι τῆς κοινωνίας, "the integrity of
your fellowship" or "your participation in the collection" [23] The
context makes it clear that God will be glorified, not simply
because the Corinthians were prepared to share their possessions,
but because of the quality of Christian living they demonstrated by
doing so. It does not refer to charity which extended beyond the
Christian society, but to the mutuality of love, which is part of the
Christian κοινωνία and which may be demonstrated in other ways
than by sharing money [24] Mutual care, accepting responsibility for
each other was for Paul an essential quality of Christian society and
his vision was of pastoral care exercised in the activities of all
members, whether in support, encouragement or even discipline.

There was, and is, an element of risk involved in such procedures,
but it was a risk that Paul was prepared to take, even with the
troublesome Corinthians. In the important matter of exercising
discipline on one who had caused pain and trouble to Paul and the
Church, Paul was content to have the reproof or punishment
delivered by the Church (2 Cor. 2: 5-11). The decision about the
form of action was taken ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων meaning either "the
main body", "the majority", or even" a considerable number"[25]
Their action displayed the mature wisdom which it was Paul's
object to have developed in believers individually and as a body.

---

23 C.K. Barrett *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. A
Commentary*, (London: A & C. Black, 1973) p. 241.
24 ibid.
25 C.K. Barrett, Comm. Op. Cit. p 91.

The failure to maintain even the appearance of unity, mutual respect and care, scandalised Paul when he heard that one member of the Church at Corinth was suing another in the civil court of a pagan city (1 Cor. 6:1-11). There were several aspects which caused him concern, not least the lack of faith, in each other's integrity, which led them to take the dispute outside the fellowship and entrust it to "pagan law courts". These members at least did not share his exalted view of the church and its members, who were to judge the world, but where deemed incompetent to settle trivial issues. Each Jewish community had its own machinery to settle civil disputes within its membership; "the least that could be expected of a Christian church was that it shared similar arrangements if necessary"[26]. If the situation had become so serious that recourse to any form of legal procedure was necessary, this represented a failure in Christian living, which had allowed malicious attitudes to develop. He reminded them that "the unjust" would not come into possession and of some of the possessions they had given up, but they had not given up wrangling. Instead of being so involved, they should have been prepared to suffer wrong than to cheat or persecute other Christians. To sum up in two points, Christians should not be involved in law suits with other Christians, but if this standard proved impossible to reach, cases between Christians should be tried by Christians.

Paul had yet another concern for the church. It was his desire to develop and maintain purity in it. There was an element of this in 1 Cor.6: 1-11, examined above, but he gave it an added intensity in 2 Cor.11 1-3 where again the corporate life is a factor also. Here he adopted the figure used in the O.T., of Israel (Isaiah 54: 5; 62:5 etc), as the Bride of God and sets himself as the one who had betrothed her in Christ. C.K. Barrett [27] followed by M.J. Harris [28]

26 (26)F.F. Bruce. *First and Second Corinthians*. (The New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1971 p. 59.
27 C.K. Barrett, Comm. Op. Cit. p. 272.

suggests that because of his part in "begetting the Corinthian Christians", Paul pictured himself as the father of the bride, but surely F.F. Bruce [29] is closer to the thought when he draws the comparison between Paul and the παρανύμφιος , "the bridegroom's friend" who among other duties was responsible for guaranteeing the chastity of the bride. He finds a parallel in John the Baptist's depiction of his role "the bridegroom's friend who stands by" (John 3: 29) "I am afraid (v.3) this is part of the pastoral burden he bears (2 Cor.11: 28) and part of his motive in writing was to do all he could to keep the church pure and chaste, a fit bride for Jesus Christ.[30]

The issues of fidelity and infidelity to Christ as they will appear at the time of presentation, the parousia were mainsprings of Paul's thought and activity. In this as in so many matters the eschatological element added a new dimension to the intensity of his feelings, so that he could refer to it as θεοῦ ζήλῳ. It was not jealousy about his own status that moved him, but concern that the purposes of God were being frustrated. This jealousy focused on the whole church at Corinth as the Bride.

We may summarise Paul's pastoral aims then. For the individual believer his hope was that each would attain to maturity in Christ, able to take his place in the church, the Body of Christ, and contribute to its life and functioning by sharing in that life and sharing his own life and love with the other members. For the church, he hoped that as a body it might develop in unity and mutual love and care.

Let us set this alongside modern pastoral thinking. For example, a modern definition of pastoral care many be offered:-

---

28 M. J. Harris. *Expositors' Bible Commentary*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976. Vol. 10 p. 385.
29 F.F. Bruce   Comm   p. 234.
30 C.K. Barrett   Comm Op. Cit.,   p. 273.

Helping acts, done by representative Christian persons, directed towards the healing, sustaining, guiding and reconciling of troubled persons, whose troubles arise in the context of ultimate meanings and concerns [31]

This has received support and acceptance from other writers [32], and may be taken as representative of much modern thought. The object of pastoral care would appear to fall within the sweep of Paul's purpose and may be assumed to represent aspects of the outworkings of his concern, but two thoughts appear to diverge from his pattern. Their concern is restricted to "troubled persons", and in their discussion of the definition they offer, they go on to say "soul care always deals with troubled persons" [33]. Paul would surely have differed. From his point of view, as long as people are on the Christian pilgrimage, they need a pastor, even if their lives are apparently trouble free. His view of pastoral care always includes the idea of nurture. Even a healthy child needs nurture.

Another difficulty may arise from the phrase "representative Christian persons." In their discussion Clebsch and Jackle incline to a preference for "authorised pastors" [34], but concede that:-

unordained and officially uncommissioned persons can also bear the authority of the Christian faith to troubled persons.[35].

This is a concession, but for Paul, pastoral care was the expression by members towards each other of the love they have found in Christ.

---

31 W.A. Clebsch and C.R. Jackle *Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective*. (New York: Harper, 1967) p. 4.
32 e.g. F. Wright op cit p. 23 c.f. Seward Hilmer *Preface to Pastoral Theology*. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1958) pp. 89ff.
33 op. cit p. 5.
34 op. cit p. 4.
35 ibid.

The focusing on "troubled persons" i.e. individuals, blots out of their view any consideration of the church as a body. The two aspects, individual care and the nurture of the body, must be held in balance and this would lead to an improved understanding of the work of pastoring today.

Let the last word be from Ernest Best [36]:

> We often thank God for Paul the theologian and Paul the missionary pioneer. I believe we can also thank God for Paul the pastor, who so demonstrated his care that his churches grew, and left an example so that the church continues to mature."

T. S. Reid.

---

36 op. cit. p. 161.

REVELATION.

A. Q. Morton

Abstract

The underestanding of Revelation depends on separating sources of the text and showing how they were combined to make one book. The paper describes modern techniques which, for the first time, enable this to be done.

The book of Revelation stands last in the New Testament. The placing seems appropriate, it was the last to gain admission to the canon and may well have been the last to take its canonical form. For some time Revelation was insecurely lodged in the New Testament; a rival book, the Shepherd of Hermas, being preferred by some churches.

Historical studies of the book of Revelation have been limited by some fundamental problems. The book employs visions and prophecies, a mode of expression which has long fallen out of use in western cultures. What may well have been clear and simple to contemporaries is now obscure. Whether the prophecies still lie in the future or were, in part if not in whole, fulfilled in the first centuries of the book's existence is open to question. The primary problem arises over the book's integrity, is it the composition of one man, as its introductory verses claim, or is it a compilation drawing on a variety of sources? Until recently no scientific technique existed which enabled the authorship of a piece of Greek prose to be established.

This has not inhibited scholars who have argued down the centuries for very different origins of sections of Revelation. Revelation is " a single and living unity from end to end " wrote Farrer in 1949, A Rebirth of Images: The Making of St. John's Apocalypse, Westminster: Dacre Press. D. H. Lawrence, in his last work written in 1931, came to a different conclusion. The text is a complex compilation. The oldest layer was a pagan text describing initiation into a mystery religion, Jewish writers revised and expanded this

text, finally it was adapted for Christian use by John of Patmos. It is hardly necessary to cite further examples of confusions and contradictions among the scholars. Only the developing of a technique which can be experimentally verified enables claims of authorship and integrity of Greek texts to be credible.

A NEW TOOL FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

It is now possible, for the first time, to resolve this question. Cusum analysis will indicate the different sources which make up the text. This technique, which has been widely used and repeatedly validated, is fully explained in the textbook, Analysing for Authorship, J. M. Farringdon, A. Q. Morton, M. G. Farringdon and M. D. Baker, University of Wales Press, 1996, ISBN 0-7083-1324-8. In this book, there are demonstrations, for example, that the utterance of identical twins can be separated, that people imitating others cannot conceal their identity, nor assume that of their target; that neither intervals of time, contrasts of subject matter, changes of mood, variety of form, or any other factor which might be supposed to affect our utterance, defeats cusum analysis. Cusum analysis is a powerful technique, which can be very effective, it is specially suited to the intensive examination of relatively short texts, such as books written and reproduced by hand, but cusum has its limitations.

Cusum comparisons will indicate a change in the source of utterance, but it will not tell when one source was joined to another, nor who did the joining. An example is Rev. 7.5-12. This differs from the preceding and following sources, it is a listing of the tribes of Israel and a vision of the chosen from all the tribes gathered before the throne. The next passage, 7.13-8.12, is a separate source. But was 7.5-12 placed after 7.4 when the book was being written in its canonical form, or is 7.5-12 part of an original sequence of sources which ran 3.6-7.4, 7.5-12, 8.13-12.10, a sequence which was then incorporated into the canonical text? This question is later considered.

A feature of cusum analysis is the revealing of anomalies in texts. These are short sequences of sentences, from a single sentence up to perhaps five sentences, which differ from the normal utterance of a person by reason of some internal, or external, constraint. The most common cause of such anomalies is a list, either compiled by the author, or copied into the text by the author. Examples are to be seen in 18.11-13, a list of luxuries, and 21.19-21, a description of the jewels adorning the foundations of the city. Cusum shows these differ from their context, but whether the difference was created by the author compiling the list, or by importing it from elsewhere, cusum will not show.

Cusum analysis of Revelation, which requires more than 100 charts to be constructed and compared, enables the separate components of the text to be delimited. The hypothesis that Revelation was the product of a single author is untenable, analysis shows the book to be a compilation. What cusum is not able to do is explain how the sources became the book. For that another technique is needed.

WRITING REVELATION.

In the first centuries of the Christian era, many people could read and write but the scribe, the professional clerk, was a common figure and played an important role in society and affairs. Personal notes, or informal copies, were written in the cursive hand, what schools now call joined writing, but any document, or any historical or literary work, was written in uncial letters, block capitals. There were no spaces between words, nor at the end of sentences; no punctuation, nor any indication of questions or quotations. The length of a text is simply the number of letters in all the words in the text.

The original of Revelation would have been written into a papyrus codex. Papyrus was the universal paper, manufactured, by a Royal monopoly, from the plant which grew in abundance along the Nile. Papyrus was sold in bundles of twenty sheets, a scapus, and in five sizes, although only the larger sheets were used in book production.

In Classical times the sheets had been glued edge to edge, with a small overlap, to make a long sheet which was then rolled round a central dowel. The Christian era saw the change to the codex form of book, in which sheets were overlaid and folded, typically five sheets folded to make a quire of twenty pages, and then bound by stitching down the centrefold. A few quires, supplied with a binding sheet, would make a book.

An important point about the codex is that it is an unforgiving form of book. Writing a text into a roll had the advantage that, if the text ran on, an extra sheet could be glued on without much trouble. If the text finished before the roll, a stroke of a knife removed the blank sheet. But in a codex, each page is part of a sheet carrying four pages, excising one page is not practicable. The roll can be adjusted to fit the text, the codex requires that the text fit the book.

Writing in a codex could be very precise, each page was identical and the columns in which the text was written were marked by pricking through the page. When the New Testament was coming into existence, codices had between 300 and 600 letters on each page, written in one or two columns.

The weakness of the papyrus codex was its inability to withstand damp. This hardly mattered round the Mediterranean shores but when the churches went further, parchment, a more expensive material, became necessary.

THE FIRST COPY OF REVELATION.

It can be said, with some confidence, that Revelation would have been written by a scribe, into a papyrus codex. The text would have been dictated, as all reading and writing were voiced until many centuries later. The codex would consist of some multiple of 20 pages. We have no way of knowing what the original would look like, but we can use a model. The complete text of Revelation in the Greek text of Aland, Black, Metzger and Wikgren, contains 45,961 letters. A suitable model will have 80 pages, holding, on

average, 574.5 letters. It is simpler to think of the text written in one column although it may well have had two columns per page. Table One sets out the sources of Revelation as delimited by cusum analysis in a model of 80 pages.

Table One.

The components of Revelation.

The First 40 pages

Source	Text	Letters	C.T.	Pages	Progress
1	1.1-6	658	658	1.15	1.15
2	1.7-2.17	3215	3873	5.60	6.75
3	2.18-3.6	1678	5551	2.92	8.67
4	3.7-7.4	7176	12727	12.49	22.15
5	7.5-12	877	13604	1.53	23.68
6	7.13-8.12	1923	15527	3.51	27.03
7	8.3-12.10	7454	22981	12.92	40.00

The Second 40 pages

1	12.11-18.10	12013	12013	20.91	20.91
2	18.11-21	1352	13365	2.35	23.26
3	18.22-21.4	5242	18607	9.12	32.39
4	21.5-14	1087	19694	1.89	34.28
5	21.15-21	777	20471	1.35	35.63
6	21.22-2219	2479	22950	4.32	39.95
7	22.20-21	30	22980	0.05	40.00

The first column of the table simply numbers the separate sources in succession. The second column indicates the text of each source, and the third column the number of letters in the words of the source. The C.T., for cumulative total, column gives the running total from the beginning of the text to the end of the source, the next two the number of pages filled by the letters of the source and then the pages filled up to that point in the progress of the book. In

the first part an average page holds 574.53 letters, in the second part 574.50 letters, a difference not only negligible but invisible.

A copy of Revelation was not a cheap and convenient personal possession, it was an expensive artefact, likely to have been paid for by a rich patron, or by some group. The scribe would plan a book in consultation with the customer. The first question would be the size of the new book. This can be answered either in terms of the sources, a book to hold all of this, and as much of this other material as will go in; or in terms of the new book, 40 pages filled by this material and the other 40 from these; or some combination of the two measures, all of this and the remaining pages filled equally from two other sources.

There is one fundamental choice. If the book is a composition, entirely the utterance from one source, all the scribe need to do is to watch that the progress of the new book and the consumption of the source keep in step. This might well mean no more than checking that at the end of a quire, likely to be every twenty pages, or even only at the half way point, the new book and the source march together. If an introduction, or an ending, had to be supplied, it would be the utterance of the author of the rest of the text and not a separate source.

In a making a compilation the situation is very different. The book has to be planned so that the desired alternation of sources enhances the book. This may make it necessary to expand a source, or to reduce it, or combine it with other material. It may be a source is regarded as inviolable and its incorporation presents a difficult editorial problem or a source might be almost purely a spacing piece, its position and size being determined by the mechanics of book production. A new beginning and an ending may well be the work of the person planning the book, and have little or no connection with any other parts of the text.

The most significant signs of the compilation are the successive sizes of the sources and the book. The ends of quires come to fulfill

a role rather like the way points of modern air-routes, the actual position is compared with the predicted position and any remedial action is put in hand. The mid-point of a new book should allow a check on progress. But by far the most indicative sign is the result of counting in the unit of the score. If you have 40 pages, the mid-point presents no problem. But if you wish to divide into thirds, you must have 13, 13 and 14 pages. The alternative is to have a column in which the number of lines is divisible by three, in which case the divisions will be very precise. Divisions which present no difficulty in current calculations, were not simple with the score as the main unit and the arithmetic then available to a scribe.

Another feature of compilations concerns the size of the sources. A few words on a scrap of paper will not long survive without being incorporated into something larger; there is a minimum length for a text which will allow separate existence. In the New Testament the two shortest books are 2nd and 3rd John which contain 1132 and 1118 letters. These might not have had a separate existence for long and the next largest book, Philemon, with 1563 letters, may be a more realistic representative of the minimum length of a text. The New Testament would then range from Luke and Acts, 95,804 and 95,696 letters to Philemon 1563 letters. It is to be noted that the longer parables and speeches in the gospels and Acts run to more than 1500 letters. The longest, the speech of Stephen in Acts 7.1-53, contains 4903 letters. The orations of Isocrates, preserved on rolls, ran from Oration 15, with 97,395 letters down to Epistle 5, with 1,572 letters.

For a source to have existed as a separate text, it would be likely to contain more than 1,500 letters, say three pages in the model of Revelation. If a source is less than this limit, it is more likely to be the product of editorial action during the construction of the book.

The simplest proceedure may well be to state the final conclusions, and then examine the evidence which supports them. Revelation is a compilation, two major sources provided the body of the book,

other smaller insertions were made to facilitate the production of the new book.

HOW REVELATION WAS WRITTEN.

The first half of Revelation ends precisely at 12.10, and contains 22,981 letters. The second half has 22,980 letters in it. A change of source comes at 12.10 and separates the two largest components of the text, the final section of part one, which runs to 13 pages, 12.97 to be precise, and the following source, the first in the second half of the book, to 21 pages, 20.91 by actual count. Of the 7 sources marked off in the first half by the cusum analysis, two, S1 and S5 are well below the limit of separate existence, one, S3 is just below it and another S6 just above it.

S1 has a complex structure and verses 1-3 differ from verses 4-6. Whatever their origin, this is evidence that Revelation is a compilation. The most obvious feature of the first half of the book is that S7, 7454 letters, is very near to filling 13 pages, the capacity of 13 pages is 7469 letters. Similarly, S4 plus S5 contain 8053 letters, 14.02 pages, the exact content of 14 pages being 8043 letters. This leaves S1 + S2 + S3 + S6 with 7474 letters, 13.01 pages. S4 + S5 +S7, contain 15,507 letters, 26.99 pages - 27 pages hold 15,512 letters This would indicate a plan having 13, 13 and 14 pages as the structural units.

The body of the first half is a single source made up by S2, S4 and S7, in all 17,845 letters, 31.06 pages, 31 pages of the model hold 17,810 letters. This has been enlarged by a beginning, S1, and the insertion of two blocks, S3 and S5 with S6.

S1 presents no problem, if a book is being made for formal use, an introduction is required. The two sections, verses 1-3 and 4-6, are conventional greetings. The following source, S2, runs from 1.7-2.17 and ends with three letters to churches, at Ephesus, Smyrna and Pergamum. The same source continues from 3.7 with letters to Philadelphia and Laodicea. The inserted material S3 has letters to

churches in Thyatira and Sardis, these are churches in the same geographical area and the letters exhibit the same causes of pastoral concern. Lacking cusum analysis it would be difficult to differentiate the two added epistles from the others.

The next insertion, 7.5-12, is in two parts, after a list of those selected from the twelve tribes of Israel, there is a vision of the lamb upon the throne. As was earlier noted, this list of tribes followed by the quotation of the responses of the crowd, are the kind of constraints which produce something unlike free composition.

S6, 7.13-8.12 is large enough to have existed separately. It also causes a minor confusion in the numbering of angels. In 7.1 we are told he saw four angels at the four corners of the earth, 7.2 adds he saw another angel, presumably number five. But 8.3 adds yet another angel who came and stood at the altar. This is followed by seven angels with as many trumpets. Chapter 9 begins with the fifth angel, usually taken as belonging to the sequence of the seven starting in 8.6: but the angel of 7.2 is also the fifth in a series.

What might at first sight appear to be an obstacle to separate origin of this source is the mention in it, at 8.1, of the seventh seal, the last in the series starting in 6.1 and carrying on to the sixth seal in 6.12. This is too simple, and can only be advanced by ignoring other examples. The six seals in chapter 6 are grouped together, all occur within the compass of 1500 letters, and the average distance between them is less that 300 letters, just over half a page. The seventh seal is five pages distant, suggesting another rhythm.

There is another series of seven, the angels of 8.6f. Within this source, there are four angels, at 8.7, 8.8, 8.10, and 8.12. The fifth angel arrives in the next source, at 9.1, the sixth follows at 9.13 and although no seventh angel is mentioned, "another mighty angel" comes down in 10.1. So we have four angels within a space of under two pages, a fifth half a page away and a sixth two and a half pages distant. In Chapter 16 we have more angels in verses 2, 3, 4,

8, 10, 12 and 17. This means six angels closely spaced, about three to a page, and the last one page off. In Chapter 14 we have angels at 14.6, 14.8 and 14.9 but no inclusive number is cited. The irregularities in these sequences make it impossible to argue that sequences in this book follow any single pattern. The sequences have no evidential value in determining the sources of the text.

The next step is to look at S2, S4 and S7 to see if they are homogeneous. They are, and so the major structural unit in this first half of Revelation is the sequence 1.7 - 2.17, 3.7 - 7.4 and 8.3 - 12.10, 17,845 letters, filling 31.06 pages of the model. . To this was added three blocks of material, a beginning, 1.1-6, the two epistles in 2.18-3.6, and 7.5-13 with 7.13-8.12. The provision of the introduction is logical, but the book would not have been much impoverished had the later additions to this part of the text not survived.

The second half of Revelation resembles the first. The body is a sequence of three sections from a single source, S1, S3 and S6, the text is 12.11-18.10, 18.22-21.4 and 21.22-22.20. In making the book, this major source was expanded by adding four small sources. None is large enough to have led a separate existence. The first, S2,18.11-21, introduces new categories of people, merchants, sea captains, and voyagers, on whom vengeance is to be wreaked. There is nothing in the source which refers to any other part of the book, nor is there any reference elsewhere to merchants and shipping. The next two come together, S4, 21.5-14 and S5, 21.15-21. The text of 21.4 reads on at 21.22 and the two sources are rather diversions than amplifications of the narrative sequence. The final source is the concluding verse and is the necessary benediction.

Revelation has been created in one stage, the two halves of the book have been constructed but there is no sign, as for example, those which abound in the gospels and Acts, of regularities made necessary by adapting a previous design. A confirmation is the few anomalies in the text. The opening verses proved two anomalies, two sections with 2 and 4 sentences. The next is 4.1-4, 4 sentences

which might well differ from their context by including
descriptions of a central throne and twenty four others round it.
The anomaly 4.9-11 is a single involved sentence which includes a
paean of praise, again it may be expected to differ from the free
composition in which it is embedded. The last anomaly in the first
half of the book is 7.2-3, another long sentence involving lists of
angels and their roles.

In the second part of Revelation there are only two anomalies,
16.10b-11 and 17.4-5. The first has no obvious cause and might be
a chance creation. The second is the description of the woman
whose forehead bore the name with a secret meaning. It is little to
be wondered that auch a passage differs from normal free
composition.

CONCLUSIONS.

The first conclusion to be drawn from the cusum
examination of Revelation is that the book is a compliation made in
a single operation; it is not, as are the gospels and Acts, an
enlargement of an existing text. The two main sources run to just
over 4,000 words and just under 5,000 words. The rest is material
required to shape these into a book. There is no sign of the small
revisions, appearing in the gospels as anomalies, which sought to
make clear things which the passing of time had made obscure.

A second conclusion is that there exists a general critical problem.
Many scholars have failed to detect the presence of two sources
each running to more than four thousand words yet claim to have
delimited very much smaller, and more complex, sources in the
text: others have asserted the unity of the text having convinced
themselves that Revelation is a composition. How sound are the
judgements based on traditional criteria?

A. Q. Morton.

Richard H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy. The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11.* J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1994.

The question of the relationship between Christians and Jews is one that is of paramount importance in these Post-Holocaust days. Almost every major church in the world has spent time studying this question. In these studies, the attempt to define the attitude of the Apostle Paul towards his own people has played a major role. The study of Romans 9-11 has in its turn been central to assessing Paul's attitude to his people. In Romans 9-10 Paul seems to be saying that only a remnant of Israel will be saved while in chapter 11 he seems to be suggesting that all Israel will finally be saved.

Richard Bell in his thought provoking book deals with an important aspect of Paul's argument in Romans 9-11, that of the Jealousy Motif. Jealousy, which is usually considered to be a negative emotion, is mentioned in Romans 10:19: 'Again I ask, did Israel not understand? First Moses says, "I will make you jealous of those who are not a nation; with a foolish nation I will make you angry."' (A quotation from Deuteronomy 31:21b; Romans 11:11 'So I ask, have they stumbled so as to fall? By no means! But through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous.' and Romans 11: 13-14 'Now I am speaking to you Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry in order to make my fellow Jews jealous, and thus save some of them.' Bell points out that these verses raise several important questions: how does the quotation from Deuteronomy answer Paul's question 'did Israel not understand'; what is the precise meaning of the verb παραζηλοῦν? What is the basis for his argument that his Gentile mission will provoke Israel to jealousy and as a result lead to the Salvation of Israel? What is the link between the provocation to jealousy and the final Salvation mentioned in Romans 11: 26 'and so all Israel will be saved'? He also sets out to deal with the question of how Paul came to the idea that Israel would be provoked to jealousy. If this came about through his own experience, then was it his personal experience before his call that he himself was provoked to jealousy, or was it

his observed experience of fellow Jews as he carried out his Gentile Mission?

In his first chapter Dr Bell gives a careful word study of the παραζηλοῦν and קנא words in the Old Testament, New Testament, Greek Old Testament, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Patristic Literature and finally in Paul. He concludes that jealousy can have two meanings, the negative meaning of 'jealous anger' and the more positive one of 'emulation'. When used in this latter sense, παραζηλοῦν, far from creating pain for Israel, is the means of bringing Israel to Salvation. The following 3 chapters are a thorough introduction to and exegesis of Romans 9-11. This exposition of Romans 9-11 will prove extremely useful to all those, scholars, students and pastors, who are grappling with these chapters, though, as one of my students plaintively asked: 'why does he not translate his long German quotations?'

Chapter 6 deals with the theological grounds for jealousy. Is it because Paul considered that the covenant privileges of Israel had been transferred to the Church (one of the most issues in Jewish Christian dialogue)? Bell concludes that the covenant privileges have not been transferred, acording to Paul, but rather they have been extended. This could be one theological ground for the jealousy motif. Three other grounds Bell lists as first an exchange of roles has taken place, secondly, the life of the Gentile Christian is characterized by grace and freedom from the law and thirdly, the image of God is being re-formed among Christians and only among Christians.

Chapter 7 argues very convincingly that Deuteronomy 32 played a significant part in the Paul's theology in Romans 9-11 and that this chapter in Deuteronomy is a primary source for Paul's theology of jealousy. Chapters 8 deals with two other possible sources for the motif, Paul's personal experience and Divine Revelation.

This is a very carefully argued, very detailed and very thoughtful book. It will have to be taken seriously in all scholarly discussions on Romans and particularly Romans 9-11.

J. C. McCullough

Alan Torrance, *Persons in Communion* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) £24.95, pp. xi + 388

This is a detailed and substantial treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity. The detail derives from its close engagement with the first volume of Barth's *Church Dogmatics*. Its substantial nature arises from the author's attempt to make trinitarian theology and discourse the focus of a broader concern for the whole business of theoloical description. Both the detail and the scope are captured in the subtitle to the volume: *An Essay on Trinitarian Description and Human Participation with special reference to Volume One of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics*.

Does this sound like a thesis title? It does, and the volume has its origins in Alan Torrance's doctoral thesis. But the author is no novice, having a well-established reputation as a theologian within a very well-established family of theologians. The basic thesis is straightforward. Barth's doctrine of the trinity is governed by his interest in the question of revelation. Divine self-communication is therefore focal in Barth's treatment. But this generates a problem. Its main symptom is Barth's celebrated reluctance to retain the notion of 'person' in relation to the trinitarian hypostases, and his opting for 'mode of being'. Torrance dissents from Barth at this point, and defends the notion of 'persons in communion'. But his peculiar contribution is to tract down the source of Barth's putative mistake. Had Barth oriented his discussion doxologically, dwelling rather on the significance of human participation in divine salvation than on the issue of human knowledge of divine action, he could and should have retained the notion of trinitarian personhood. Indeed, the retention of that notion unsubstitutably enables us to integrate our human language about, worship of, reflection on and life in, God. Torrance's discussion consequently ranges widely, with considerable attention given to the question of analogical speech about God and with concluding remarks on doxological theology.

The case is diligently and persuasively argued. Some Barth scholars will doubtless question whether concentration on *Church Dogmatics* 1/1 skews the treatment, but the way that the argument is set out and the references to later portions of the *Church Dogmatics* show that the author wants to stave off this criticism. The main substantive point of the volume is solidly and soundly made. Alan Torrance presupposes two things in his readers. The first is a willingness to forgo any temptation to light reading or predilection for jaunty prose, in order to concentrate hard on the *res*. Put it another way: the style is occasionally rather heavy. The second is a conviction that a sophisticated and confident handling of the trinitarian being of God is both possible and important for the healthy integration of ecclesial life, thought and worship. Put it more straightforwardly; it is an essay for those who prize high-level theological conceptualization as a means of truly knowing God. The first point is a relatively minor matter of taste. The second introduces a clearly major consideration re theology. With regard to this latter point, Alan Torrance's work provokes similar questions to those provoked by the work of his subject (Karl Barth) and his uncle (Tom Torrance), notwithstanding the differences between these two. From all, we learn how great, true, and effective a service to gospel and church can be rendered by thinking which seeks to be faithfully grounded in divine revelation and in the apprehension of the divine majesty. From all, even Barth, some of us come away with a nagging worry about the potential for excessive theological dependence on - when it comes down to it - philosophical conceptualization in the articulation of Christian belief.

Be that as it may, Alan Torrance has produced an impressive and rewarding book, worthy of equal consideration alongside the many volumes that have come out on the Trinity over recent years. He is to be congratulated on it.

Stephen Williams
Union Theological College
Belfast.